

Applicants: Chen et al.
Application No.: 10/694,117

REMARKS

Claims 1-20 are pending in this Application. In the present Office Action, claims 1-20 were rejected. The Examiner objected to claims 7, 11, and 18.

The Applicants have amended claims 1-4, 7-8, 11 and 18. Support for the amendments can be found in at least Paragraph [0027] of the specification as well as in Figures 2 and 3. No new matter has been added.

Claim Objections

Claims 7, 11 and 18 were objected to because of informalities. These claims have been amended in accordance with the Examiner's requirements.

Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully request the Examiner withdraw the objections.

Claim Rejections

35 U.S.C. §112

Claim 7 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112 since the only "first output terminal" described is located in the first sub-circuit, rather than the second sub-circuit. By this amendment, claim 7 recites that the second sub-circuit outputs the amplified driving signal via "a third output terminal."

Therefore, the Applicants respectfully request the Examiner withdraw the rejection.

35 U.S.C. §103

Regarding claims 1-10

APA in view of Kubota and Asada fails to disclose or suggest any buffer circuit **outputting the amplified driving signal to the active matrix and the second sub-circuit via the first output terminal and the second output**

terminal, respectively as recited in amended claim 1 of the present application. According to the recitation, the buffer circuit has **two** output ends, one being for the active matrix and the other is for the second sub-circuit. In fact, the buffer circuit B2 in APA, considered by the examiner as equivalent to the buffer circuit of the present invention (page 4 of outstanding Office Action, last paragraph), has **only one** output end for both the active matrix and the second sub-circuit.

Further, Kubota's buffer circuit constructed of a plurality of inverter circuits for supplying signal g11 to the scanning signal line GL1 (col. 38, lines 25-26) also has **only one** output end for the scanning signal line GL1. Similarly, Asada's non-inverting buffer 104 has **only one** output end. As discussed, no one of the buffer circuit in APA, Kubota's buffer circuit and Asada's non-inverting buffer can be viewed as equivalent as the buffer circuit of the present invention. According to MPEP 8th ed. 706.02(j), to establish a prima facie case of obviousness, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. Applicant states that the prior art references do not teach or suggest all the claim limitations, i.e. a buffer circuit outputting the amplified driving signal to the active matrix and the second sub-circuit via the first output terminal and the second output terminal, respectively.

Hence, amended independent claim 1 and the related claims 2-10, depending either directly or indirectly thereupon, are unobvious over APA in view of Kubota and Asada, whether taken alone or in any combination with one another.

Regarding claims 11-17

APA in view of Kubota and Asada fails to disclose or suggest any second output terminal **electrically connected to the signal amplifying device, the unidirectional conducting device and a next sub-circuit** as recited in independent claim 11 of the present application. At first, the second output terminal in APA is electrically connected to the signal amplifying device and the next sub-circuit, but not the unidirectional conducting device (Fig. 1 in APA). Also, Kubota's signal line for transmitting signal /n1, considered by the examiner as equivalent to the second output terminal I2 of the present invention (page 6 of outstanding Office Action, lines 14-15), is just connected to the buffer circuit (a plurality of inverter circuits) and the next latch circuit LS-SR (Fig. 31 in Kubota).

Hence, there is no equivalent element in APA and Kubota as the second output terminal capable of transferring the amplified driving signal to both the unidirectional conducting device and the next sub-circuit as recited in independent claim 11.

As stated above, since the prior art references do not teach or suggest all the claim limitations, i.e. a second output terminal electrically connected to said signal amplifying device, said unidirectional conducting device and a next sub-circuit for transferring said amplified driving signal to said unidirectional conducting device and said next sub-circuit, independent claim 11 and the related claims 12-17, depending either directly or indirectly thereupon, are unobvious over APA in view of Kubota and Asada, whether taken alone or in any combination with one another.

Regarding claims 18-20

APA in view of Kubota and Asada fails to disclose or suggest any buffer circuit comprising a signal amplifying device for amplifying power of the driving signal to output an amplified driving signal, an output terminal for transferring the amplified driving signal to a next sub-circuit, and a unidirectional conducting device for transferring the amplified driving signal to one scan line unidirectionally as recited in claim 18 of the present application. In the recitation, the amplified driving signal is transferred to a next sub-circuit and one scan line through an output terminal and a unidirectional conducting device, respectively. As described in regarding claims 1-10, no one of the buffer circuit in APA, Kubota's buffer circuit and Asada's non-inverting buffer can achieve the complete function of the buffer circuit as claimed since the buffers in the prior art references don't have two output

Applicants: Chen et al.
Application No.: 10/694,117

ends to transfer the amplified driving signal and the unidirectional amplified driving signal.

Accordingly, independent claim 18 and claims 19-20 depending thereupon are unobvious over APA in view of Kubota and Asada, whether taken alone or in any combination with one another.

Applicants: Chen et al.
Application No.: 10/694,117

Conclusion

The Applicants thank the Examiner for his consideration and believe that, in view of the foregoing remarks, the Application is now in condition for allowance. Early and favorable consideration is respectfully solicited.

If the Examiner has any questions regarding the foregoing remarks, or the Examiner believes that advancement to allowance could be more quickly achieved via a telephone conference with the Applicants, the Examiner is requested to telephone the Applicants' undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

Chen et al.

By Thomas A. Mattioli
Thomas A. Mattioli
Registration No. 56,773

Volpe and Koenig, P.C.
United Plaza, Suite 1600
30 South 17th Street
Philadelphia, PA 19103
Telephone: (215) 568-6400
Facsimile: (215) 568-6499

TAM/yil